

REMARKS ON CLAIM REJECTIONS

1. Claim 2-32:

5 The applicant has amended these claims for specifically pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter of the present invention with very detailed claim language including step by step teaching.

10 a) The applicant referenced the cellular telephone/mobile device as CT/MD at the beginning of the specification under the Background of the invention section. The applicant notes the examiners comments and has deleted the abbreviation CT/MD from all the claim language to provide clarity.

 b) Claim 3 has likewise has been amended.

 c) Claim 4 has been amended to provide an antecedent basis for the device referred in here.

15 d) Claim 6 has been amended.

 e) Claim 5, 7-32 have been modified for clear teaching in conjunction with claim 2 which is structured in detail for teaching the invention clearly.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22:

20 Examiner has cited Thompson (US 5,465,401) in view of Gardner (US 5,533,029) as prior art. The applicant respectfully submits the following remarks for distinguishing over prior art.

 Referring now to Figure 1 of Thompson, the device consists of the means for receiving a wireless communication signal and means for connecting to a land line. The device has a single processor and a single antenna. Consequently the Thompson device has the means for
25 communication at any given time over a single wireless communication path.

 Whereas Rao et al teach a cellular telephone/mobile device that has a plurality of wireless input and output ports with one or more transmitters and receivers associated with each input and output port. Additionally, Rao et al teach a wireless device that has multiple antennas as part of the wireless device for concurrently receiving wireless communication data in real time on each
30 antenna and the means for processing said data using one or more processors internal to the

wireless device. In addition the Rao teaching enables the transmission and receiving of information on one or more inputs and outputs of the wireless device concurrently.

The data rates of wireless communication using a single antenna are limited due to laws of physics. This limitation is overcome by Rao et al in a novel manner in the present invention. To illustrate the significant difference over Thompson even if combined with Gardener:

Rao et al overcome this physical wireless data rate limitation in a novel way by enabling a first wireless device with multiple antennas such that a single data stream may be dynamically deconstructed into multiple segments, having each individual resulting segment transmitted from a first source concurrently on one or more output ports by means of a common transmitter or a dedicated transmitter associated with each output port; and

receiving said segmented data streams sent by the first wireless device by a second target wireless device (could also be a server) that also has multiple antennas and multiple receivers/input ports such that the individual segmented data streams received on each input port of the second wireless device are processed internal to the second wireless device for assembly into the original single data stream using one or more processors. This significantly increases the data rates of communication between the first wireless device and the second wireless device. Thompson nor Gardener teach any of these novel features.

The Thompson teaching refers to a device that can operate at an assigned frequency such as a cellular frequency at any given time. The Thompson does not teach the means for concurrently operating at more than one frequency since this is physically not possible with the single antenna, a single transmitter/receiver or the limited processing capability of a single processor. Additionally Thompson does not teach the means for multiplexing the single antenna for a plurality of uses nor the ability to multiplex an input/output for a plurality of uses. Rao et al teach the ability to multiplex inputs/outputs and the antennas for one or more uses in conjunction with the tremendous processing capabilities of a single processor or multiple processors.

The applicants respectfully submit that Thompson even if combined with Gardener does not teach the novel features of the Rao teaching in conjunction with the amended claims. The applicant has amended the claims such that the claims are very detailed for clear and unambiguous teaching of the present invention.

REMARKS

This in response to the Office Action dated 11/06/2003. The Examiner objected to the
5 drawings and specification procedurally. Amended specification and drawings are included
herewith.

Examiner objected to the claims citing prior art. The applicant has amended the claims
for the purpose of presenting the claims in better form, with the objective of correcting the claim
language and grammar. The applicant has amended and structured the previously included
10 claims for very detailed and unambiguous teaching. The applicant has also included herein
extensive reasons as to why the present invention clearly distinguishes over prior art:

Consideration and approval is respectfully requested.

15 Respectfully submitted,



By

Raman K. Rao, Applicant

20 Raman K. Rao
3099 Alexis Drive,
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1304
Telephone: (650) 941-7096
25 Fax: (650) 618-1553
Email: rrao@ist.com